

REMARKS

In the outstanding official action, claims 6-10 and 16-20 were allowed, claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 19 were objected to as having insufficient antecedent basis for a recited limitation, and claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 were rejected on the merits.

In response, all of the objected-to claims have been amended to provide proper and sufficient antecedent basis for the recited limitation, and it is accordingly respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn. On the merits, claims 6-10 and 16-20 were allowed, claims 3-5 and 13-15 were deemed to be allowable if placed in independent form, claims 1 and 11 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Houtum et al and claims 2 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Van Houtum et al in view of Cimini Jr. et al, for the reasons of record.

In response, the indication of allowable subject matter in this application is noted with appreciation, although the allowable claims have not been placed in independent form at this time pending a final determination of the rejected claims.

On the merits, it was suggested in the Action that all of the limitations of independent claims 1 and 11 are shown in the

cited portions of the Van Houtum reference. Applicant respectfully traverses this suggestion, as it is respectfully submitted that certain key limitations recited in the claims are not shown or even suggested by the cited and applied reference. More particularly, the production of an equalized output from a frequency domain input and a frequency domain inverse channel estimate does not appear to be shown or suggested, and additionally the calculation of the frequency domain inverse channel estimate utilizing a least cost function does not appear to be particularly shown or suggested in the cited portions of the reference.

Furthermore, regarding the rejection of claims 2 and 12, it is respectfully submitted that it would not be obvious to combine the teachings of these two references absent the benefit of impermissible hindsight derived from the instant disclosure, since the references are directed to substantially different structures, namely a transmission system having improved signal conditioning as opposed to channel estimation in a multi-carrier system. Furthermore, it would require undue experimentation for one of ordinary skill in the art to select one small teaching from the extensive (18 column) detailed and highly complex mathematical description contained in Cimini

absent the benefit of impermissible hindsight derived from the instant disclosure.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the currently-pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Steven R. Biren, Reg. 26,531
Attorney
(914) 333-9630